

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

SEAN DeCRANE,)	CASE NO. 1:16 CV 2647
)	
Plaintiff,)	JUDGE CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO
)	
v.)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE
)	WILLIAM H. BAUGHMAN, JR.
EDWARD ECKART, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
Defendants.)	

Yet another discovery dispute has been referred to me by Judge Boyko in this case.¹ Counsel have submitted correspondence to the Court regarding this latest matter on referral.

Counsel for the plaintiff complains that the defendants have produced emails in response to discovery requests but have not produced attachments to those emails. Counsel for the defendants respond that the plaintiff's charge as to this discovery violates the timely presentation requirements of Local Civil Rule 37.1(b). Further counsel objects that production of the attachments would be unduly burdensome and disproportional to the needs of this case.

The timely presentation objection fails in the larger context of the multiple discovery disputes that counsel have engaged in and brought to the Court for

¹Non-document order of February 5, 2018.

resolution. Counsel have been disputing the scope of discovery from at least the time of the first dispute in December of 2017.²

Because the documents in question are attachments to emails already produced, the defendants are ordered to produce the attachments on or before February 22, 2018, without prejudice to a motion by the defendants for reimbursement of all or a portion of the expense and cost of this production after a decision on the merits of this case. The production may be made subject to the protective order entered herein.³

The referral to resolve this dispute is terminated.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 13, 2018

s/ William H. Baughman, Jr.
United States Magistrate Judge

²ECF #29.

³ECF #25.